

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN RE: ASBESTOS PRODUCTS : Consolidated Under  
LIABILITY LITIGATION (No. VI) : MDL DOCKET NO. 875

VARIOUS PLAINTIFFS

**FILED**

v.

MAR 27 2012

08-92066

VARIOUS DEFENDANTS

MICHAEL E. KUNZ, Clerk  
By Dep:Clerk

Cases listed in Exhibit "A,"  
attached

O R D E R

AND NOW, this 26th day of March, 2012, it is hereby ORDERED  
that Defendants' Motions for Summary Judgment, listed in Exhibit  
"A," attached, are GRANTED.<sup>1</sup>

AND IT IS SO ORDERED.



EDUARDO C. ROBRENO, J.

---

<sup>1</sup> Plaintiffs have not opposed Defendants' motions for summary judgment. As provided under local rules, the Court must independently determine that the moving parties are entitled to judgment as a matter of law. See Loc. R. Civ. P. 7.1(c).

The bases for Defendants' motions are that Plaintiffs have failed to raise a genuine issue of material fact as to whether Plaintiffs' asbestos-related injuries were caused by products manufactured, supplied, or distributed by these Defendants.

Based on the uncontested evidence presented by Defendants, the Court concludes that these Defendants are entitled to judgment as a matter of law.

EXHIBIT A

KARST, et al. v. AW CHESTERTON COMPANY, et al. (2:11-cv-63945) (D. S.C.)

1. Motion for Summary Judgment of Defendant CBS Corp. (doc. no. 24)
2. Motion for Summary Judgment of Defendant Bayer Cropscience, Inc. (doc. no. 27)
3. Motion for Summary Judgment of Defendant Grinnell, LLC (doc. no. 34)
4. Motion for Summary Judgment of Defendant Milwaukee Valve Co. (doc. no. 38)
5. Motion for Summary Judgment of Defendant Goulds Pumps, Inc. (doc. no. 39)
6. Motion for Summary Judgment of Defendant Crane Co. (doc. no. 40)

2:08-cv-92066, Gehrt: Doc. 170, Motion for Summary Judgment of Defendant Owens-Illinois